

REMARKS

As an initial matter, applicant thanks SPE Park and Examiner Pachol for the courtesies extended to the undersigned in the telephone interview conducted on February 19, 2009.

Claims 1-33 are pending in this application. By the present Amendment, claims 1, 11, 14 and 24 have been amended to clarify the claimed subject matter. Claims 1-33 remain pending upon entry of this Amendment, with claims 1, 11, 14 and 24 being in independent form.

The title was objected to as purportedly not descriptive. The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a). Claims 1, 11, 14 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite.

In response, the application has been amended to address the formal issues referenced in the Office Action. For example, the claims have been amended to clarify that it is the facsimile transmission, and NOT the notification, that is performed to the receiving end.


Claims 1-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,809,116 to Cairo in view of Tanimoto (US 2003/0020960 A1). Claims 7-10, 13, 20-23 and 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as purportedly unpatentable over Cairo in view of Tanimoto and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,025,931 to Bloomfield.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art, as discussed and as SPE Park and Examiner Pachol agreed in the February 19, 2009 telephone interview, does not disclose or suggest the aspect of the present application of outputting a communication result notification indicative of a result of the facsimile transmission, **ONLY WHEN** the specific destination identifying section finds the corresponding destination name in the specific destination name storage section.

Tanimoto, as understood by applicant, proposes, as shown in Fig. 10 (reproduced below),

that the user is allowed, upon user indication of a transmission destination, to select whether a delivery confirmation message will be transmitted (step S2 in Fig. 10) and designate a communication mode (step S4 in Fig. 10).

FIG. 10



In Tanimoto, if the user does NOT designate a communication mode (step S8, NO, Fig. 10), the machine will determine *quality of image data transmission to be performed*, by consulting with receiving ability column of data table T1 (see Fig. 2 of Tanimoto) with respect to transmission destination (step S14 in Fig. 11). However, the machine in Tanimoto determines, INDEPENDENT of the receiving ability as determined by consulting the data table T1, whether to transmit a delivery confirmation message IN ACCORDANCE WITH USER INDICATION in the delivery confirmation mail request screen (Fig. 15a).

Tanimoto simply does not involve outputting a communication result notification indicative of a result of the facsimile transmission, *ONLY WHEN* the specific destination identifying section finds the corresponding destination name in the specific destination name storage section.

Likewise, the other cited references do not disclose or suggest the aspect of the present application of outputting a communication result notification indicative of a result of the facsimile transmission, *ONLY WHEN* the specific destination identifying section finds the corresponding destination name in the specific destination name storage section.

Applicant submits that the cited art, even when considered along with common sense and common knowledge to one skilled in the art, does *NOT* render unpatentable the above-mentioned aspect of the present application.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, 14 and 24, and the claims depending therefrom, are allowable over the cited art.

In the February 19, 2009 telephone interview, SPE Park stated that the stamp mark referenced in the claims and in the specification cannot be a “result” notification since according to Fig. 2 it is applied after reading of the document is completed and before the end of the

transmission.

However, applicant pointed out that paragraph [0026] of the application states that "... The printed stamp mark on the document indicates that the document has been scanned or, has been scanned and transmitted to the specific destination." Accordingly, applicant submits that the stamp mark referenced in the specification and in claim 7 (but not expressly recited in independent claims 1, 11, 14 and 24) can be a result notification.

In view of the remarks hereinabove, applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, applicant earnestly solicits the allowance of the application.

If a petition for an extension of time is required to make this response timely, this paper should be considered to be such petition. The Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees that are required in connection with this amendment, and to credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 03-3125.

If a telephone interview could advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



PAUL TENG, Reg. No. 40,837
Attorney for Applicant
Cooper & Dunham LLP
Tel. (212) 278-0400